# Stabilization of Systems with Asynchronous Sensors and Controllers

Masashi Wakaiki, Kunihisa Okano, and João P. Hespanha

arXiv:1601.07888v1 [cs.SY] 28 Jan 2016

**Abstract**

We study the stabilization of networked control systems with asynchronous sensors and controllers. Clock offsets between the sensor and the controller are unknown and modeled as parametric uncertainty. First we consider MIMO systems and provide a sufficient condition for the existence of controllers that are capable of stabilizing the closed-loop system for every clock offset in a given range. For scalar systems, we next obtain the maximum length of the offset range for which the system can be stabilized by a linear time-invariant controller. Finally, this bound is compared with the offset bounds that would be allowed if we restricted our attention to static output feedback controllers.

## I. Introduction

In networked control systems, real-time sensor data is often not available at the controller side due to transmission delays. A solution to time-varying delays is that the sensor sends to the controller the measurements with time-stamps to provide information on sampling instants [7]. However, if the local clocks at the sensor and at the controller are not synchronized, then the time-stamps and the true sampling instants may not match. Protocols to establish synchronization have been actively studied as surveyed in [14], and synchronization by the global positioning system (GPS) or radio clocks has been utilized in practical systems. Nevertheless, synchronizing

This paper was partially presented at the 2015 American Control Conference, July 1-3, 2015, the USA. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. CNS-1329650. M. Wakaiki acknowledges Murata Overseas Scholarship Foundation for the support of this work. K. Okano is supported by JSPS Postdoctoral Fellowships for Research Abroad. Corresponding author M. Wakaiki. Tel. +1 805 893 7785. Fax +1 805 893 3262.

The authors are with the Center for Control, Dynamical-systems and Computation (CCDC), University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106-9560 USA (e-mail:{masashiwakaiki, kokano, hespanha}@ece.ucsb.edu).

clocks over networks has fundamental limits [5]. Furthermore, a recent work [9] has shown that synchronization technologies based on GPS signals may be vulnerable against malicious attacks. We therefore address control with uncertainty in time.

In this paper, we study the stabilization problem for a system that has asynchronous sensing and control. The controller side can use the time-stamps but does not know the actual sampling instants or the clock offset between the sensor and the controller. Our objective is to determine how large the clock offset can be without compromising the existence of a stabilizing linear time-invariant (LTI) controller. Moreover, if one exists, we want to design such a controller.

We assume that the clock offset between the sensor and the controller is constant. Clock properties are affected by environment such as temperature and humidity, but the change of such properties are slow for the time scales of interest. Furthermore, the difference of clock frequencies can be ignored. This is justified by noting, e.g., that the time synchronization technique proposed in [8] achieves the asymptotic error convergence of clock frequencies in the mean square sense despite random delays.

We formulate the stabilization of systems with clock offsets as the problem of stabilizing systems with parametric uncertainty, which can be regarded as the simultaneous stabilization of a family of plants studied in [16, Sec. 5.4] and [17]. However, we had to overcome a few technical difficulties that distinguish the problem considered here from previously published results:

*Infinitely many plants:* We consider a family of plant models that is indexed by a continuous-valued parameter. Such a family includes infinitely many plants, but the approaches based on linear matrix inequalities (LMIs), e.g., in [15] exploit the property that the number of plant models is finite.

*Non-linearity of the uncertain parameter:* In this work, the uncertain parameter appears in a non-linear form, and we have a non-convex parameter set. Therefore, we cannot use the LMI-based techniques in [2] for the robust stabilization of systems with polytopic uncertainties.

*Common unstable poles and zeros:* Earlier studies on simultaneous stabilization consider a restricted class of plants. For example, the sufficient condition in [1] is obtained for a family of plants with no common unstable zeros or poles. The set of plants in [11] has common unstable zeros (or poles) but all the plants are stable (or minimum-phase). These assumptions are not satisfied for the systems in the present paper.

Technically, we make the following contributions for multi-input multi-output (MIMO) systems and scalar systems, respectively:

*MIMO systems:* First we show that an algebraic approach to the simultaneous stabilization problem provides a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a controller that stabilizes the system for every clock offset in a given range. This necessary and sufficient condition is not numerically testable, but using a small gain argument, we construct a one-block $\mathcal{H}^\infty$ control problem that provides a testable sufficient condition for stabilizability. We also construct a stabilizing controller from the solution of the $\mathcal{H}^\infty$ control problem.

*Scalar systems:* For the special case of scalar systems, our system with clock offsets can be regarded as an interval system, which has been studied in [6], [13]. In conjunction with the Nevanlinna-Pick interpolation problem (see, e.g., [3, Chap. 2]), the necessary and sufficient condition obtained for the MIMO case gives an explicit formula for the exact bound on the clock offset that can be allowed for stability. We also show that the permissible range of the clock offset varies depending on the class of the controllers. In particular, the use of LTI controllers doubles the admissible range of clock offsets with respect to the use of linear static controllers.

Our previous work [12] has considered systems with time-varying clock offsets and has proposed a stabilization method with causal controllers, based on the analysis of data rate limitations in quantized control. The stability analysis of systems with variable clock offsets and saturation has been investigated in [18]. The major difference from these works is that here we consider only constant offsets and study stabilization limitations that arise from using LTI controllers.

This paper is based on the conference paper [19]. Here, the preliminary results for single-input systems is extended to the MIMO case, and we illustrate the relationship between the maximum offset length and the system's instability.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the closed-loop system we consider and presents the problem formulation. In Section 3, we obtain a sufficient condition for the stabilizability of general-order systems. In Section 4, we derive the exact bound on the permissible clock offset for scalar systems. Section 5 is devoted to stabilizability with static controllers and the comparison of the offset bounds obtained for LTI controllers and static controllers.

*Notation and definitions:* Let $\mathbb{Z}_+$ be the set of non-negative integers. Let $\mathbb{D}$, $\bar{\mathbb{D}}$, and $\mathbb{T}$ denote

the open unit disc $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : \ |z| < 1\}$, the closed unit disc $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : \ |z| \leq 1\}$, and the unit circle $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : \ |z| = 1\}$, respectively.

We denote by $\mathcal{RH}^\infty$ the space of all bounded holomorphic real-rational functions in $\mathbb{D}$. Let us denote the field of fraction of $\mathcal{RH}^\infty$ by $\mathcal{RF}^\infty$.

For a commutative ring $R$, $\mathbf{M}(R)$ denotes the set of matrices with entries in $R$, of whatever order. For $M \in \mathbf{M}(\mathbb{C})$, let $\|M\|$ be the induced 2-norm. For $G \in \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{RH}^\infty)$, the $\mathcal{RH}^\infty$-norm is defined as $\|G\|_\infty = \sup_{z \in \mathbb{D}} \|G(z)\|$.

A pair $(N, D)$ in $\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{RH}^\infty)$ is said to be *right coprime* if the Bezout identity $XN + YD = I$ holds for some $X, \ Y \in \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{RH}^\infty)$. $P \in \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{RF}^\infty)$ admits a *right coprime factorization* if there exist $D, \ N \in \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{RH}^\infty)$ such that $P = ND^{-1}$ and the pair $(N, D)$ is right coprime. Similarly, a pair $(\tilde{D}, \ \tilde{N})$ in $\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{RH}^\infty)$ is *left coprime* if the Bezout identity $\tilde{N}\tilde{X} + \tilde{D}\tilde{Y} = I$ holds for some $\tilde{X}, \ \tilde{Y} \in \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{RH}^\infty)$. $P \in \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{RF}^\infty)$ admits a *left coprime factorization* if there exist $\tilde{D}, \ \tilde{N} \in \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{RH}^\infty)$ such that $P = \tilde{D}^{-1}\tilde{N}$ and the pair $(\tilde{D}, \tilde{N})$ is left coprime. If $P$ is a scalar-valued function, we use the expressions *coprime* and *coprime factorization*.

## II. Problem Statement

Consider the following plant:

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu(t), \tag{1}$$

where $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are the state and the input of the plant, respectively. Using a sampler and a zero-order hold (ZOH), we connect this continuous-time plant with a discrete-time controller according to the diagram in Fig. 1.

Let $s_1, s_2, \ldots$ be sampling instants from the perspective of the controller clock, which, without loss of generality, is assumed to be exact. The sensor measures the state $x(s_k)$ and sends it to the controller together with a time-stamp. However, since the sensor and the controller share no global clock, the time-stamp determined by the sensor typically includes an unknown offset with respect to the controller clock. In this paper, we assume that the offset is constant, that is, the time-stamp $\hat{s}_k$ reported by the sensor is given by

$$\hat{s}_k = s_k + \Delta \qquad (k \in \mathbb{N}) \tag{2}$$





Fig. 1: Closed-loop system with clock offsets.





Fig. 2: Sampling instants $s_k$, reported time-stamps $\hat{s}_k$, and updating instants $t_k$ of the zero-order hold.

for some unknown constant $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}$. This means that there is a constant offset between the sensor/controller clocks but no difference in their frequencies, or that this difference is negligible for the time-scales of interest.

Let $h > 0$ be the update period of the ZOH. The control signal $u(t)$ is assumed to be piecewise constant and updated periodically at times $t_k = kh$ ($k \in \mathbb{N}$) with values $u_k$ computed by a controller: $u(t) = u_k$ for $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1})$. While the ZOH updates $u(t)$ periodically, the true sampling times $s_k$ and the reported sampling times $\hat{s}_k$ may not be periodic. However, we do assume that both $s_k$ and $\hat{s}_k$ do not fall behind $t_k$ by more than the ZOH update period $h$. Moreover, the controller receives the time-stamped data $(x(s_k), \hat{s}_k)$ from the sensor by the next ZOH-updating instant $t_{k+1}$. The assumptions are formally stated as follows.

**Assumption 2.1:** *For every $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $s_k, \hat{s}_k \in [t_k, t_{k+1})$. Furthermore, $x(s_k)$ and $\hat{s}_k$ are available to the controller by time $t = t_{k+1}$.*

Fig. 2 shows the timing diagram of the sampling instants $s_k$, the reported time-stamps $\hat{s}_k$, and updating instants $t_k$ of the control inputs.

In order to periodically obtain state estimates at time $h, 2h, 3h, \ldots$, from the time-stamped data $(x(s_k), \hat{s}_k)$ received non-periodically, we use the following estimator:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\hat{x}}(t) &= A\hat{x}(t) + Bu(t), && (t_k \le t < t_{k+1}) \\ \hat{x}(\hat{s}_k) &= x(s_k), && (k \in \mathbb{Z}_+), \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the estimated state. Note that if $s_k = \hat{s}_k$, then $x(t_{k+1}) = \hat{x}(t_{k+1})$, and this estimator would consistently produce $\hat{x}(t) = x(t)$ for all $t$. This estimator leads to the discretized extended system in Fig. 1, with state and input given by

$$\xi_k = \begin{bmatrix} x(t_k) - \hat{x}(t_k) \\ \hat{x}(t_k) \end{bmatrix}, \qquad u_k = u(t_k),$$

respectively, which evolve according to

$$\xi_{k+1} = F_\Delta \xi_k + G_\Delta u_k, \qquad y_k = H_\Delta \xi_k, \tag{4}$$

where $\Lambda := e^{Ah}$, $\Theta := e^{-A\Delta} - I$, and

$$\begin{aligned} F_\Delta &:= \begin{bmatrix} -\Lambda\Theta & -\Lambda\Theta \\ \Lambda(I+\Theta) & \Lambda(I+\Theta) \end{bmatrix} \\ G_\Delta &:= \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda\left(\int_0^h e^{-A\tau}d\tau - (I+\Theta)\int_0^{h-\Delta} e^{-A\tau}d\tau\right)B \\ \Lambda(I+\Theta)\int_0^{h-\Delta} e^{-A\tau}d\tau B \end{bmatrix} \\ H_\Delta &:= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

The derivation of (5) is straightforward and can be found in Appendix A.

The objective of the present paper is to determine how large the clock offset $\Delta$ can be allowed without compromising the existence of a discrete-time LTI controller that stabilizes the closed loop for every admissible clock offset. Specifically, we want to solve the following problem:

**Problem 2.2:** *Given an interval $[\underline{\Delta}, \overline{\Delta}]$, determine if there exists a feedback controller that stabilizes the extended system* (4) *for every $\Delta \in [\underline{\Delta}, \overline{\Delta}]$. Furthermore, if one exists, find such a conroller.*

To solve this problem, it is necessary that the extended system (4) has a stabilizing controller for each $\Delta$, which justifies our second assumption.

**Assumption 2.3:** *For all $\Delta \in [\underline{\Delta}, \overline{\Delta}]$, $(F_\Delta, G_\Delta, H_\Delta)$ is stabilizable and detectable.*

**Remark 2.4:** In Problem 2.2, we consider only stability of (4) and thus of the sampled system with state $x(t_1), x(t_2), \ldots$. However, we can easily see from the plant linearity that this discrete-time stability leads to $x(t)$, $\hat{x}(t) \to 0$ $(t \to \infty)$; see Appendix B.

**Remark 2.5:** From the parity interlacing property [21], we can check the simultaneous stabilizability of any two plants in a family of plant models in (4), which gives a necessary condition for the solvability of Problem 2.2.

**Remark 2.6:** If $A$ is invertible, then we can rewrite $G_\Delta$ in (5) as

$$G_\Delta = \begin{bmatrix} -\Lambda\Theta A^{-1}B \\ (\Lambda(I+\Theta) - I)A^{-1}B \end{bmatrix}. \tag{6}$$

In fact, since

$$\int_0^h e^{-A\tau} d\tau = -(e^{-Ah} - I)A^{-1},$$

$(1,1)$-element of $G_\Delta$ in (5) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} &\Lambda \left( \int_0^h e^{-A\tau} B d\tau - (I+\Theta) \int_0^{h-\Delta} e^{-A\tau} B d\tau \right) \\ &\quad = \Lambda \left( -(e^{-Ah} - I)A^{-1}B + e^{-A\Delta}(e^{-A(h-\Delta)} - I)A^{-1} \right) B \\ &\quad = \Lambda(I - e^{-A\Delta})A^{-1}B \\ &\quad = -\Lambda\Theta A^{-1}B. \end{aligned}$$

After calculating $(1,2)$-element of $G_\Delta$ similarly, we obtain (6).

## III. Analysis via Simultaneous Stabilization

We first consider a general simultaneous stabilization problem not limited to the system introduced in Section 2.

The transfer function $P$ of the system $\xi_{k+1} = F\xi_k + G_k u_k,\ y_k = H\xi_k$ is usually defined by the Z-transform of the system's impulse response, i.e., $H(zI - F)^{-1}G$, but in this paper, we define the transfer function $P$ by $P(z) := H(1/z \cdot I - F)^{-1}G$ for consistency of the Hardy space theory; see [16, Sec. 2.2] for details. We say that $C \in \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{RF}^\infty)$ *stabilizes* $P \in \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{RF}^\infty)$ if $(I+PC)^{-1}$, $C(I+PC)^{-1}$, and $(I+PC)^{-1}P$ belong to $\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{RH}^\infty)$. We recall that when these three transfer functions belong to $\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{RH}^\infty)$, they will have no poles in the closed unit disk.

Consider the family of plants $P_\theta \in \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{RF}^\infty)$ parameterized by $\theta \in S$, where $S$ is a nonempty parameter set, and assume that we have a doubly coprime factorization of $P_\theta$ over $\mathcal{RH}^\infty$ for all $\theta \in S$:

$$\begin{bmatrix} Y_\theta & X_\theta \\ -\tilde{N}_\theta & \tilde{D}_\theta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} D_\theta & -\tilde{X}_\theta \\ N_\theta & \tilde{Y}_\theta \end{bmatrix} = I, \tag{7}$$

where $P_\theta = N_\theta D_\theta^{-1}$ and $P_\theta = \tilde{D}_\theta^{-1}\tilde{N}_\theta$ are a right coprime factorization and a left coprime factorization, respectively.

The following theorem gives a necessary and sufficient condition for simultaneous stabilization:

**Theorem 3.1 ([16], [17]):** *Given a nonempty set $S$, consider the plant $P_\theta$ having a doubly coprime factorization* (7) *for each $\theta \in S$. Fix $\theta_0 \in S$ and define*

$$\begin{bmatrix} U_\theta & V_\theta \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{D}_\theta & \tilde{N}_\theta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{Y}_{\theta_0} & -N_{\theta_0} \\ \tilde{X}_{\theta_0} & D_{\theta_0} \end{bmatrix} \qquad (\theta \in S). \tag{8}$$

*Then $(V_\theta, U_\theta)$ is right coprime for every $\theta \in S$. Moreover, there exists a controller that stabilizes $P_\theta$ for every $\theta \in S$ if and only if there exists $Q \in \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{RH}^\infty)$ such that for all $\theta \in S$,*

$$(U_\theta + V_\theta Q)^{-1} \in \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{RH}^\infty). \tag{9}$$

*Such a stabilizing controller is given by*

$$C := (\tilde{X}_{\theta_0} + D_{\theta_0} Q)(\tilde{Y}_{\theta_0} - N_{\theta_0} Q)^{-1}. \tag{10}$$

**Remark 3.2:** A *left* coprime factorization of stabilizing controllers is used in [16, Sec. 5.4] and [17], whereas we represent controllers by a *right* coprime factorization in (10). Therefore, Theorem 3.1 is slightly different from the counterpart in [16, Sec. 5.4] and [17]. The reason why we use a right coprime factorization is that $\tilde{D}_\theta$ of our system (4) and (5) can be explicitly obtained for all $\theta$, as we shall see Proposition 3.5 below.

It is often not easy to verify that the transfer function $Q$ satisfying (9) exists in a computationally efficient fashion. To address this challenge, we use a one-block $\mathcal{H}^\infty$ control problem, whose solvability is sufficient for the existence of the transfer function $Q$ satisfying (9).

**Theorem 3.3:** *Given a nonempty set $S$, assume that each plant $P_\theta$ ($\theta \in S$) has a doubly coprime factorization* (7) *such that there exists $\theta_0 \in S$, $L \in \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{RF}^\infty)$, and $R(\theta) \in \mathbf{M}(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying $\tilde{D}_\theta = \tilde{D}_{\theta_0}$ and*

$$\tilde{N}_\theta(z) - \tilde{N}_{\theta_0}(z) = R(\theta)L(z), \tag{11}$$

*for all $\theta \in S$. If there exists $Q \in \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{RH}^\infty)$ satisfying the following one-block $\mathcal{H}^\infty$ norm condition:*

$$\|L(\tilde{X}_{\theta_0} + D_{\theta_0}Q)\|_\infty < \frac{1}{\sup_{\theta\in S}\|R(\theta)\|}, \tag{12}$$

*then $Q$ satisfies* (9)*, and hence the controller $C$ in* (10) *stabilizes $P_\theta$ for every $\theta \in S$.*

**Remark 3.4:** We can solve the problem of finding $Q \in \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{RH}^\infty)$ in (12) by reducing it to the Nehari problem. Therefore the sufficient condition in Theorem 3.3 can be checked by efficient matrix computations; see [4, Chapter 8] for details.

For the system (4) and (5), Proposition 3.5 below will facilitate verifying the assumptions on $\tilde{D}_\theta$ and $\tilde{N}_\theta$ in Theorem 3.3 and give an explicit formula for $R$ and $L$ in (11).

**Proof of Theorem 3.3:** We define $U_\theta$ and $V_\theta$ as in (8). Since $\tilde{D}_\theta = \tilde{D}_{\theta_0}$, it follows from (8) and the Bezout identity $\tilde{D}_{\theta_0}\tilde{Y}_{\theta_0} + \tilde{N}_{\theta_0}\tilde{X}_{\theta_0} = I$ in (7) that

$$\begin{aligned} U_\theta &= \tilde{D}_\theta\tilde{Y}_{\theta_0} + \tilde{N}_\theta\tilde{X}_{\theta_0} \\ &= I + ((\tilde{D}_\theta - \tilde{D}_{\theta_0})\tilde{Y}_{\theta_0} + (\tilde{N}_\theta - \tilde{N}_{\theta_0})\tilde{X}_{\theta_0}) \\ &= I + (\tilde{N}_\theta - \tilde{N}_{\theta_0})\tilde{X}_{\theta_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since $\tilde{D}_{\theta_0}^{-1}\tilde{N}_{\theta_0} = N_{\theta_0}D_{\theta_0}^{-1}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V_\theta &= -\tilde{D}_\theta N_{\theta_0} + \tilde{N}_\theta D_{\theta_0} \\ &= -\tilde{D}_\theta(N_{\theta_0}D_{\theta_0}^{-1} - \tilde{D}_\theta^{-1}\tilde{N}_\theta)D_{\theta_0} \\ &= -\tilde{D}_{\theta_0}(\tilde{D}_{\theta_0}^{-1}\tilde{N}_{\theta_0} - \tilde{D}_{\theta_0}^{-1}\tilde{N}_\theta)D_{\theta_0} \\ &= (\tilde{N}_\theta - \tilde{N}_{\theta_0})D_{\theta_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $U_{\theta_0} + V_\theta Q = I + (\tilde{N}_\theta - \tilde{N}_{\theta_0})(\tilde{X}_{\theta_0} + D_{\theta_0}Q)$. In conjunction with the small gain theorem, this equation shows that if

$$\|(\tilde{N}_\theta - \tilde{N}_{\theta_0})(\tilde{X}_{\theta_0} + D_{\theta_0}Q)\|_\infty < 1 \qquad (\theta \in S), \tag{13}$$

then (9) holds for all $\theta \in S$. From the assumption (11),

$$\|(\tilde{N}_\theta - \tilde{N}_{\theta_0})(\tilde{X}_{\theta_0} + D_{\theta_0}Q)\|_\infty \le \|R(\theta)\| \cdot \|L(\tilde{X}_{\theta_0} + D_{\theta_0}Q)\|_\infty.$$

Hence if $Q$ satisfies (12) for all $\theta \in S$, then (13) holds, and hence $P_\theta$ is simultaneously stabilizable by $C$ in (10) from Theorem 3.1. ■

The proposition below shows that the system (4) always satisfies the assumptions on $\tilde{D}_\theta$ and $\tilde{N}_\theta$ in Theorem 3.3. We also obtain $R$ and $L$ in (11) without calculating a coprime factorization of $P_\theta$ for all $\theta \in S$.

**Proposition 3.5:** Let Assumption 2.3 hold and suppose that $0 \in [\underline{\Delta}, \overline{\Delta}]$. Define the transfer function $P_\Delta(z) := H_\Delta(1/z \cdot I - F_\Delta)^{-1}G_\Delta$. For all $\Delta \in [\underline{\Delta}, \overline{\Delta}]$, there exists a doubly coprime factorization (7) such that $\tilde{D}_\Delta = \tilde{D}_0 = I - ze^{Ah}$, and (11) holds with

$$\begin{aligned} R(\Delta) &:= \textstyle\int_0^\Delta e^{-A\tau}d\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n} \\ L(z) &:= z(z-1)e^{Ah}B \in (\mathcal{RH}^\infty)^{n\times m}. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

**Proof:** Let us first obtain another realization $(\bar{F}_\Delta, \bar{G}_\Delta, \bar{H}_\Delta)$ of the system (4). We can transform $F_\Delta$ into

$$\bar{F}_\Delta := T^{-1}F_\Delta T = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{where} \quad T := \begin{bmatrix} -\Theta & -I \\ I+\Theta & I \end{bmatrix}.$$

Furthermore, if we define

$$J_1 := \int_0^h e^{-A\tau}d\tau, \qquad J_2 := \int_0^{h-\Delta} e^{-A\tau}d\tau,$$

then we obtain

$$\bar{G}_\Delta := T^{-1}G_\Delta = \begin{bmatrix} -\Lambda J_1 B \\ -\Lambda(J_1 - (I+\Theta)J_2)B - \Theta\Lambda J_1 B \end{bmatrix}.$$

Also we have $\bar{H}_\Delta := H_\Delta T = [I+\Theta \quad I]$. We have thus another realization $(\bar{F}_\Delta, \bar{G}_\Delta, \bar{H}_\Delta)$ for $P_\Delta$.

From detectability in Assumption 2.3, for every $\Delta \in [\underline{\Delta}, \overline{\Delta}]$, there exists a matrix $W_\Delta$ such that $\bar{F}_\Delta - W_\Delta\bar{H}_\Delta$ is Schur stable. Using such a matrix $W_\Delta$, we can write $\tilde{D}_\Delta$ as

$$\tilde{D}_\Delta = I - \bar{H}_\Delta(1/z \cdot I - (\bar{F}_\Delta - W_\Delta\bar{H}_\Delta))^{-1}W_\Delta;$$

see, e.g., [16, Theorem 4.19]. Since $I+\Theta = e^{-A\Delta}$, the inverse of $I+\Theta$ exists for all $\Delta \in [\underline{\Delta}, \overline{\Delta}]$.

Set

$$W_\Delta := \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda(I+\Theta)^{-1} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then we have

$$\bar{F}_\Delta - W_\Delta\bar{H}_\Delta = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\Lambda(I+\Theta)^{-1} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

and hence $\bar{F}_\Delta - W_\Delta \bar{H}_\Delta$ is Schur stable. Furthermore,

$$I - \bar{H}_\Delta (1/z \cdot I - (\bar{F}_\Delta - W_\Delta \bar{H}_\Delta))^{-1} W_\Delta = I - z\Lambda.$$

Noticing that the right-hand side of the equation above does not depend on $\Delta$, we have $\tilde{D}_\Delta = \tilde{D}_0 = I - z\Lambda$.

Since $\tilde{D}_\Delta = \tilde{D}_0$, it follows that $\tilde{N}_\Delta - \tilde{N}_0 = \tilde{D}_0(P_\Delta - P_0)$. From the realization $(\bar{F}_\Delta, \bar{G}_\Delta, \bar{H}_\Delta)$, we see that

$$P_\Delta(z) = z\big((I+\Theta)(I - z\Lambda)^{-1}\Lambda J_1 - \Lambda(J_1 - (I+\Theta)J_2) - \Theta\Lambda J_1\big)B.$$

Since $\Theta = 0$ and $J_2 = J_1$ for $\Delta = 0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} P_\Delta(z) - P_0(z) = z\big(&\Theta(I - z\Lambda)^{-1}\Lambda J_1 \\ &- \Lambda(J_1 - (I+\Theta)J_2) - \Theta\Lambda J_1\big)B. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$J_1 - (I+\Theta)J_2 = \int_0^\Delta e^{-A\tau} d\tau =: \bar{\Theta},$$

and

$$\bar{\Theta}A = -\int_0^\Delta \left(\frac{d}{d\tau} e^{-A\tau}\right) d\tau = I - e^{-A\Delta} = \Theta. \tag{16}$$

Since $A(I - z\Lambda) = A - zAe^{Ah} = A - ze^{Ah}A = (I - z\Lambda)A$, it follows that $A(I - z\Lambda)^{-1} = (I - z\Lambda)^{-1}A$. Therefore we derive from (15)

$$P_\Theta - P_0 = z\Lambda\bar{\Theta}(I - z\Lambda)^{-1}\left(-I + z\Lambda(I - AJ_1)\right)B.$$

Similarly to (16), we have

$$I - AJ_1 = I - A\int_0^h e^{-A\tau} d\tau = e^{-Ah} = \Lambda^{-1},$$

and hence $P_\Theta - P_0 = z(z-1)\Lambda\bar{\Theta}(I - z\Lambda)^{-1}B$. Since $\lambda$, $\bar{\Theta}$, and $(I - z\Lambda)^{-1}$ are commutative, we derive

$$P_\Theta - P_0 = z(z-1)(I - z\Lambda)^{-1}\bar{\Theta}\Lambda B,$$

and $\tilde{N}_\Delta - \tilde{N}_0 = z(z-1)\bar{\Theta}\Lambda B$. Thus (11) holds with $R$ and $L$ defined by (14). ■

## IV. Exact Bound for Scalar Systems

In this section, the plant class is restricted to scalar systems, and we reduce the necessary and sufficient condition for stabilizability in Theorem 3.1 to a computationally verifiable one, which gives an explicit formula for the exact bound on the clock offset that LTI controllers can allow.

Consider an unstable scalar plant: $\dot{x} = ax + bu$ with $a > 0$. If $a < 0$, the stabilization problem is trivial because a zero control input $u(t) = 0$ leads to the stability of the closed-loop system. So in the reminder o this section, we will focus our attention to the case $a > 0$. The case $a = 0$ will be addressed separately later.

Solving explicitly the integrals that appear in (5), the extended system (4) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{k+1} &= \begin{bmatrix} -\lambda\theta & -\lambda\theta \\ \lambda(1+\theta) & \lambda(1+\theta) \end{bmatrix} \xi_k + \frac{b}{a} \begin{bmatrix} -\lambda\theta \\ \lambda(1+\theta) - 1 \end{bmatrix} u_k \\ y_k &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \xi_k, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where $\lambda := e^{ah}$ and $\theta := e^{-a\Delta} - 1$. In what follows, we take $b/a = 1$ for simplicity of notation, because stabilizability does not depend on the value of this ratio.

The extended system (17) is stabilizable and detectable except for $\theta = -1$, at which point the system loses detectability. Since $\theta = e^{-a\Delta} - 1$, it follows that

$$\Delta \in [\underline{\Delta}, \overline{\Delta}] \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \theta \in [e^{-a\overline{\Delta}} - 1, e^{-a\underline{\Delta}} - 1] =: S. \tag{18}$$

We have from Assumption 2.1 that $-h < \Delta < h$, and hence the set $S$ on $\theta$ is a subset of

$$(e^{-ah} - 1, e^{ah} - 1) =: S_{\max}. \tag{19}$$

As in Section 3, taking the Z-transform of (17) and then mapping $z \mapsto 1/z$, we obtain the transfer function $P_\theta$:

$$P_\theta(z) = \frac{(\lambda - 1)z}{1 - \lambda z} - \theta \frac{\lambda z(z-1)}{1 - \lambda z} \quad (\theta \in S \subset S_{\max}). \tag{20}$$

The system (20) belongs to a class of the so-called interval systems. The stabilization of general interval systems has been studied, e.g., in [6], [13]. Here we shall develop a new approach based on Theorem 3.1.

*A. Main result for scalar plants*

The following theorem gives the exact bound on the clock offset for scalar systems:

**Theorem 4.1:** *Define* $\lambda := e^{ah}$ *and* $\theta := e^{-a\Delta} - 1$. *Let* $\underline{\theta} < 0 < \overline{\theta}$ *and consider the set* $S$ *in* (18) *of the form* $S = [\underline{\theta}, \overline{\theta}] \subset S_{\max}$. *There exists a controller that stabilizes* $P_\theta$ *in* (20) *for all* $\theta \in S$, *that is, there exists* $Q \in \mathcal{RH}^\infty$ *satisfying* (9) *for all* $\theta \in S$ *if and only if*

$$(\lambda - 1)^2\overline{\theta} - (\lambda + 1)^2\underline{\theta} < 4\lambda. \tag{21}$$

*In particular, if* $-\underline{\theta} = \overline{\theta}$, *then* (21) *is equivalent to*

$$\overline{\theta} < \frac{2\lambda}{\lambda^2 + 1}. \tag{22}$$

*Furthermore, define a conformal mapping* $\phi$ *from* $\mathbb{G} := \mathbb{C} \setminus \{(-\infty, 1/\underline{\theta}] \cup [1/\overline{\theta}, \infty)\}$ *to* $\mathbb{D}$ *by*

$$\phi : \ \mathbb{G} \to \mathbb{D} : \ s \mapsto \frac{1 - \sqrt{(1 - \overline{\theta}s)/(1 - \underline{\theta}s)}}{1 + \sqrt{(1 - \overline{\theta}s)/(1 - \underline{\theta}s)}}. \tag{23}$$

*If* (21) *holds, then a finite-dimensional stabilizing controller* $C$ *is given by*

$$C := \frac{X_0 + D_0 Q}{Y_0 - N_0 Q}, \qquad Q := \frac{\phi^{-1} \circ g - T_1}{T_2},$$

*where the* $\mathcal{RH}^\infty$ *functions* $N_0$, $D_0$, $X_0$, $Y_0$, $T_1$, *and* $T_2$ *are defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} N_0(z) &:= \frac{(\lambda - 1)z}{z - c}, \qquad D_0(z) := \frac{1 - \lambda z}{z - c} \\ X_0(z) &:= \frac{1 - c\lambda}{\lambda - 1}, \qquad Y_0(z) := -c \\ T_1(z) &:= \lambda \frac{1 - c\lambda}{\lambda - 1} \frac{z(z-1)}{z - c}, \ T_2(z) := \lambda \frac{z(z-1)(1 - \lambda z)}{(z - c)^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

*for any arbitrarily fixed* $c \in \mathbb{C}$ *with* $|c| > 1$, *and any rational function* $g : \ \bar{\mathbb{D}} \to \mathbb{D}$ *that satisfies the interpolation conditions* $g(0) = \phi(0)$, $g(1) = \phi(0)$, *and* $g(1/\lambda) = \phi(-1)$. *Such a function* $g$ *always exists if* (21) *holds.*

**Proof:** See Section 4.2. ■

**Remark 4.2:** The rational function $g$ in Theorem 4.1 can be obtained from the Schur-Nevanlinna algorithm; see, e.g., [10], [20].

**Remark 4.3:** Since the inverse mapping $\phi^{-1}$ is given by the following rational function:

$$\phi^{-1}(s) = \frac{4s}{\overline{\theta}(s + 1)^2 - \underline{\theta}(s - 1)^2}, \tag{25}$$

the stabilizing controller $C$ is finite dimensional for a rational function $g$.

If we change the offset variable from $\theta = e^{-a\Delta} - 1$ to $\Delta$, then (18) and (21) give the maximum length of the offset interval $[\underline{\Delta}, \overline{\Delta}]$ allowed by an LTI controller.

**Corollary 4.4:** Assume $-h < \underline{\Delta} < 0 < \overline{\Delta} < h$. There exists a controller that stabilizes the extended system (17) for all $\Delta \in [\underline{\Delta}, \overline{\Delta}]$ if and only if

$$\overline{\Delta} - \underline{\Delta} < \frac{2\left(\log(e^{ah}+1) - \log(e^{ah}-1)\right)}{a}. \tag{26}$$

**Proof:** See Section 4.2. ■

**Remark 4.5:** In the case $a = 0$, the extended system $P_\Delta$ is given by

$$P_\Delta(z) = \frac{hz}{1-z} - \Delta z.$$

Similarly to the case $a > 0$, one can show that there exists a controller stabilizing $P_\Delta$ for all $\Delta \in (-h, h)$. This result is consistent with that in the case when $a \to 0$ in Corollary 4.4, but we omit the proof for brevity.

**Example 4.6:** Consider a scalar plant with unstable pole $a = 1$. In Fig. 3, we plot the maximum length of the offset interval $(\underline{\Delta}, \overline{\Delta})$ versus the ZOH-update period $h$. The solid line is the maximum length $\overline{\Delta} - \underline{\Delta}$ and the vertical dotted lines indicate $h = h_0 := (\log(1+\sqrt{2}))/a$. If $h < h_0$, then the restriction $-h < \underline{\Delta} < \overline{\Delta} < h$ arising from Assumption 2.1 gives the bound $\overline{\Delta} - \underline{\Delta} < 2h$. On the other hand, if $h \geq h_0$, then $\overline{\Delta} - \underline{\Delta}$ is bounded by (26). The maximum offset length $\overline{\Delta} - \underline{\Delta}$ exponentially decreases as $h \geq h_0$ becomes larger.

### *B. Proofs of Theorem 4.1 and Corollary 4.4*

We prove Theorem 4.1 by reducing the stabilization problem to a Nevanlinna-Pick interpolation problem. This reduction relies on results stated in Lemmas 4.7 and 4.9 have appeared in [6], [13], but we give new proofs of these results in the appendix, based on Theorem 3.1.

First we show that the stabilization problem is equivalent to an interpolation problem with a specified codomain:

**Lemma 4.7:** *Let $\underline{\theta} < 0 < \overline{\theta}$ and $S := [\underline{\theta}, \overline{\theta}] \subset S_{\max}$. There exists a controller that stabilizes $P_\theta$ in* (20) *for all $\theta \in S$, that is, there exists $Q \in \mathcal{RH}^\infty$ satisfying* (9) *for all $\theta \in S$ if and only if there exists $f \in \mathcal{RH}^\infty$ such that $f$ is a map from $\bar{\mathbb{D}}$ to $\mathbb{G} := \mathbb{C} \setminus \{(-\infty, 1/\underline{\theta}] \cup [1/\overline{\theta}, \infty)\}$ and satisfies the interpolation conditions $f(0) = 0$, $f(1) = 0$, and $f(1/\lambda) = -1$.*

**Proof:** See Appendix C. ■





Fig. 3: Maximum offset length $\overline{\Delta} - \underline{\Delta}$ versus ZOH-update period $h$ (unstable pole $a = 1$): The solid line is the maximum offset length. The vertical dotted line indicates $h = (\log(1 + \sqrt{2}))/a$.

From Lemma 4.7, it suffices to study the following interpolation problem for stabilizability:

**Problem 4.8:** *Let $z_1, \ldots, z_n$ be distinct points in $\bar{\mathbb{D}}$ and let $w_1, \ldots, w_n$ belong to $\mathbb{G} := \mathbb{C} \setminus \{(-\infty, 1/\underline{\theta}] \cup [1/\overline{\theta}, \infty)\}$. Find a function $f \in \mathcal{RH}^\infty$ such that*

$$f : \bar{\mathbb{D}} \to \mathbb{G} \quad \textit{and} \quad f(z_i) = w_i \quad (i = 1, \ldots, n). \tag{27}$$

We solve Problem 4.8 by reducing it to the Nevanlinna-Pick interpolation. To this effect, we need a conformal map from $\mathbb{G}$ to $\mathbb{D}$. In [13], [3, Section 4.1], such a conformal map $\phi$ is given in (23).

Using the conformal map defined in (23), we see that Problem 4.8 can be reduced to the Nevanlinna-Pick interpolation problem.

**Lemma 4.9:** *Problem 4.8 is solvable if and only if the following Nevanlinna-Pick interpolatoin problem is solvable: Find a function $g \in \mathcal{RH}^\infty$ such that*

$$g : \bar{\mathbb{D}} \to \mathbb{D} \quad \textit{and} \quad g(z_i) = \phi(w_i) \quad (i = 1, \ldots, n). \tag{28}$$

**Proof:** See Appendix C. ■

Interpolating functions and a conformal map in Lemma 4.9 are illustrated by the commutative diagram in Fig. 4.

Finally we obtain the proof of Theorem 4.1.





Fig. 4: Interpolating functions $f, g$ and a conformal map $\phi$.

**Proof of Theorem 4.1:** Lemmas 4.7 and 4.9 show that the stabilization problem for systems with clock offsets can be reduced to the Nevanlinna-Pick interpolation problem with a boundary condition; see, e.g., [3, Sec. 2.11] for the interpolation problem. We therefore obtain a necessary and sufficient condition based on the positive definiteness of the associated Pick matrix:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \frac{1-|\phi(-1)|^2}{1-1/\lambda^2} \end{bmatrix} > 0. \tag{29}$$

From the Schur complement formula, (29) is equivalent to

$$\frac{1-|\phi(-1)|^2}{1-1/\lambda^2} > 1. \tag{30}$$

We see that (30) is

$$\lambda^2 \left| 1 - \sqrt{\frac{1+\overline{\theta}}{1+\underline{\theta}}} \right|^2 < \left| 1 + \sqrt{\frac{1+\overline{\theta}}{1+\underline{\theta}}} \right|^2. \tag{31}$$

Since $-1 < \underline{\theta} < \overline{\theta}$, it follows that (31) is equivalent to

$$(p-1)^2(1+\overline{\theta}) < (p+1)^2(1+\underline{\theta}). \tag{32}$$

After rearranging this, we derive (21). ■

**Proof of Corollary 4.4:** Substituting $\underline{\theta} = e^{-a\overline{\Delta}} - 1$ and $\overline{\theta} = e^{-a\underline{\Delta}} - 1$ into (32), we obtain

$$(\lambda-1)^2 e^{-a\underline{\Delta}} < (\lambda+1)^2 e^{-a\overline{\Delta}},$$

and hence

$$e^{a(\overline{\Delta}-\underline{\Delta})} < \left(\frac{\lambda+1}{\lambda-1}\right)^2.$$

Taking the logarithm function of both sides gives the desired conclusion. ■

## V. Stabilizability with Static Controllers

In this section, the bounds on the clock offset that were obtained for LTI controllers (from Theorems 4.1 and 3.3) are compared with the exact bound that would be allowed if we restricted our attention to a time-invariant static output feedback controller, and with an offset range that gives a sufficient condition for the existence of a time-varying 2-periodic static output feedback controller. We also derive a bound obtained using standard robust control tools, regarding the clock offset as an additive uncertainty.

### *A. Comparison with time-invariant/2-periodic static controllers*

The proposition below gives the exact bound on the clock offset that could be obtained using a static stabilizer for a scalar plant.

**Proposition 5.1:** *Consider the extended system* (17)*. Define* $\lambda := e^{ah}$*,* $\theta := e^{-a\Delta} - 1$*, and* $S_{\max}$ *as in* (19)*. There exists a static output feedback controller* $u_k = -Ky_k$ *that achieves* $\lim_{k\to\infty} \xi_k = 0$ *for every* $\theta \in S \subset S_{\max}$ *if and only if*

$$S \subset \left(-\frac{1}{\lambda},\ \frac{1}{\lambda}\right). \tag{33}$$

**Proof:** Without loss of generality, we assume that $b/a = 1$. Introducing the static controller

$$u_k = -K \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \xi_k$$

into the extended system (17), we have

$$\xi_{k+1} = \begin{bmatrix} -\lambda\theta & -\lambda\theta(1-K) \\ \lambda(1+\theta) & \lambda(1+\theta)(1-K)+K \end{bmatrix} \xi_k. \tag{34}$$

From the Jury stability criterion, the above system is stable if and only if the following three inequalities hold:

$$(\lambda - 1)(K - 1) > 0 \tag{35}$$

$$\lambda\theta K + 1 > 0 \tag{36}$$

$$2\lambda\theta K + (\lambda - 1)K - \lambda - 1 < 0. \tag{37}$$

From (35) and $\lambda > 1$, we have

$$K > 1. \tag{38}$$

Therefore (36) and (37) give a lower and upper bound on $\theta$, respectively:

$$\theta > -\frac{1}{\lambda K}, \quad \theta < \frac{p+1}{2\lambda K} - \frac{\lambda - 1}{2\lambda}. \tag{39}$$

Notice that the lower (upper) bound in (39) is increasing (decreasing) with respect to $K$. Hence these bounds take the inifimum and the supremum under (38) when $K \to 1$, and

$$\lim_{K\to 1}\left(-\frac{1}{\lambda K}\right) = -\frac{1}{\lambda}, \quad \lim_{K\to 1}\left(\frac{p+1}{2\lambda K} - \frac{\lambda-1}{2\lambda}\right) = \frac{1}{\lambda}.$$

Thus, there exists a static controller $K$ that stabilizes the extended system (17) for all $\theta \in S$ if and only if $S$ satisfies (33). ■

The next result provides a sufficient condition on the offset range $(\underline{\theta}, \overline{\theta})$ for the existence of time-varying 2-periodic controllers that stabilize the extended system (17).

**Proposition 5.2:** *Consider the extended system* (17)*. Define* $\lambda := e^{ah}$*,* $\theta := e^{-A\Delta} - 1$*, and* $S_{\max}$ *as in* (19)*. There exists a 2-periodic static controller*

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_k \\ u_{k+1} \end{bmatrix} = -\begin{bmatrix} K_1 & 0 \\ 0 & K_2 \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} y_k \\ y_{k+1} \end{bmatrix} \tag{40}$$

*that achieves* $\lim_{k\to\infty}\xi_k = 0$ *for every* $\theta \in S \subset S_{\max}$ *if*

$$S \subset \left(-\frac{1}{\lambda\kappa}, \ \frac{1}{\lambda\kappa}\right), \tag{41}$$

*where*

$$\kappa := \frac{\sqrt{\lambda^2+1}\sqrt{\lambda^2 - 4\sqrt{2}+5} - 2\left(\sqrt{2}-1\right)\lambda}{\lambda^2 - 1} < 1.$$

**Proof:** This is also based on the Jury stability criterion; See Appendix D. ■

We are now in a position to compare the bounds (22), (33), and (41). For all $\lambda = e^{ah} > 1$, a routine calculation shows that

$$\frac{1}{\lambda} < \frac{1}{\lambda\kappa} < \frac{2\lambda}{\lambda^2+1}. \tag{42}$$

As expected, the offset condition (33) for time-invariant static controllers results in the smallest range for values of $\theta = e^{-a\Delta} - 1$ because the set of all time-invariant static controllers is a subset of the class of LTI controllers and that of 2-periodic static controllers in (40). On the other hand, 2-periodic static stabilizers do not belong to the class of LTI controllers, and vice versa. The second inequality in (42) always holds for all $\lambda > 1$, but the bound (42) is a sufficient condition. In order to compare the ability to robustly stabilize the closed loop of 2-periodic static





Fig. 5: Comparison among the maximum offset length $\overline{\Delta} - \underline{\Delta}$ obtained using each class of controllers ($h = 1$): The solid (dashed) line is the exact bound on the maximum offset length allowed by LTI (time-invariant static) controllers. The dashed-dotted line is a lower bound on the maximum offset length by 2-periodic static controllers.

controllers versus LTI controllers, we need to do a brute-force computation for the exact bound on clock offset that would be allowed by a 2-periodic static controller.

**Example 5.3:** Consider a scalar plant with ZOH-update period $h = 1$. Fig. 5 shows the maximum offset lengths $\overline{\Delta} - \underline{\Delta}$ allowed by LTI stabilizers and static ones, which are obtained by Theorem 4.1 and Proposition 5.1, respectively. The figure also gives a lower bound on the maximum offset length obtained using 2-periodic static stabilizers, which is derived from Proposition 5.2. All lines decreases exponentially as the unstable pole $a$ grows to $\infty$. If the unstable pole $a$ is smaller than 0.9, then Assumption 2.1 gives the bound $\overline{\Delta} - \underline{\Delta} < 2h = 2$. Also, we observe that LTI controllers double the robustness with respect to that achieved by time-invariant static controllers. For example, for the unstable pole $a = 1$, the maximum offset length by LTI controllers is $\overline{\Delta} - \underline{\Delta} = 1.544$, whereas that by time-invariant static controllers is $\overline{\Delta} - \underline{\Delta} = 0.7719$.

### B. Conservativeness due to the small gain theorem

The sufficient condition in Theorem 3.3 with

$$L(z) := \frac{\lambda z(z-1)}{z-c}, \qquad R(\theta) := \theta \qquad (c \in \mathbb{C},\ |c| > 1)$$

in (11), shows that there exists a controller stabilizing $P_\theta$ for all $\theta \in (-1/\lambda, 1/\lambda)$. This bound of $\theta$ is the same as that was obtained in (33) for a static controller, which shows that the use of the small gain theorem is as conservative as the restriction of controllers to static gains.

This conservativeness arises from the codomain of interpolating functions. For simplicity, let the offset bound $[\underline{\theta}, \overline{\theta}] = [-1, 1]$. In Theorem 3.3, the stabilization problem we consider is equivalent to finding $f : \bar{\mathbb{D}} \to \mathbb{D}$ satisfying $f(0) = 0$, $f(1) = 0$, $f(1/\lambda) = -1$. Recall that a necessary and sufficient condition for stabilization in Lemma 4.7 is the existence of a function $f : \bar{\mathbb{D}} \to \mathbb{G} = \mathbb{C} \setminus \{(-\infty, 1] \cup [1, \infty)\}$ satisfying the same interpolation conditions. The difference between the codomains $\mathbb{D}$ and $\mathbb{G}$ leads to conservativeness in the stabilization analysis.

### C. Regarding a clock offset as an additive uncertainty

The transfer function $P_\theta$ in (20) can be viewed as a perturbation of the nominal transfer function $P_0 = (\lambda - 1)z/(1 - \lambda z)$ by the following additive uncertainty:

$$P_\theta(z) - P_0(z) = m(z) W_\theta(z)$$

where

$$m(z) := \frac{z(\lambda - z)}{1 - \lambda z}, \quad W_\theta(z) := \frac{\theta \lambda (z-1)}{\lambda - z}.$$

Since $|m(e^{j\omega})| = 1$, it follows that

$$|P_\theta(e^{j\omega}) - P_0(e^{j\omega})| \le |W_{\overline{\theta}}(e^{j\omega})|$$

for all $e^{j\omega} \in \mathbb{T}$ and $\theta \in [-\overline{\theta}, \overline{\theta}]$ with $\overline{\theta} > 0$. Hence, as shown in [3, Sec. 3.5], there exists a controller stabilizing $P_\theta$ for all $\theta \in [-\overline{\theta}, \overline{\theta}]$ if $\overline{\theta}$ satisfies

$$\left\| W_{\overline{\theta}}(X_0 + Q D_0) \right\|_\infty < 1 \tag{43}$$

for some $Q \in \mathcal{RH}^\infty$, where the $\mathcal{RH}^\infty$ functions $X_0$ and $D_0$ are part of the coprime factorization $P_0 = N_0/D_0$ satisfying the Bezout identity $N_0 X_0 + D_0 Y_0 = 1$. Reducing the problem of finding $Q \in \mathcal{RH}^\infty$ with (43) to the Nevanlina-Pick interpolation problem as in [3, Sec. 4.3], we see that $\overline{\theta}$ satisfies (43) for some $Q \in \mathcal{RH}^\infty$ if and only if $\overline{\theta} < 1/\lambda$.

This bound derived from the classical approach of $\mathcal{H}^\infty$ robust control turns out to also coincide with the one in (33) obtained for a static controller. This shows that the classical $\mathcal{H}^\infty$ robust control approach uses an unnecessarily large class of parametric uncertainty. In conjunction with the observation in Section 5.2, this discussion implies that the use of the small gain theorem, the over-approximation of a offset uncertainty by an $\mathcal{H}^\infty$-additive uncertainty, and the restriction of controllers to static gains have the same level of conservativeness for scalar plants.

## VI. Concluding Remarks

We studied the problem of stabilizing systems in which the sensor and the controller have a constant clock offset. We formulated the problem as the stabilization problem for systems with parametric uncertainty. For MIMO systems, we derived a sufficient condition that is numerically testable, based on the results of simultaneous stabilization. For scalar systems, using the Nevanlinna-Pick interpolation, we obtained the maximum offset length that can be allowed by an LTI controller. We compared the robustness against clock offsets between LTI controllers and static ones. However, a full investigation of the problem for general-order systems is still an open area for future research.

## Appendix

### A. Derivation of (5)

First we describe $\hat{x}(t_{k+1})$ by using $x(t_k)$ and $u_k$. From (3), we have

$$\hat{x}(t_{k+1}) = e^{A(t_{k+1}-\hat{s}_k)}\hat{x}(\hat{s}_k) + \int_{\hat{s}_k}^{t_{k+1}} e^{A(t_{k+1}-\tau)}Bd\tau \cdot u_k \tag{44}$$

and

$$\hat{x}(\hat{s}_k) = x(s_k) = e^{A(s_k-t_k)}x(t_k) + \int_{t_k}^{s_k} e^{A(s_k-\tau)}Bd\tau \cdot u_k. \tag{45}$$

Substituting (45) into (44), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{x}(t_{k+1}) = e^{A(t_{k+1}-\hat{s}_k)} \cdot e^{A(s_k-t_k)}x(t_k) + \int_{\hat{s}_k}^{t_{k+1}} e^{A(t_{k+1}-\tau)}Bd\tau \cdot u_k \\ + e^{A(t_{k+1}-\hat{s}_k)} \int_{t_k}^{s_k} e^{A(s_k-\tau)}Bd\tau \cdot u_k.\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

Since $t_{k+1} - t_k = h$ and $\hat{s}_k = s_k + \Delta$, it follows that

$$e^{A(t_{k+1}-\hat{s}_k)} \cdot e^{A(s_k-t_k)} = e^{A(h-\Delta)}. \tag{47}$$

Also

$$e^{A(t_{k+1}-\hat{s}_k)}\int_{t_k}^{s_k} e^{A(s_k-\tau)}d\tau = \int_{t_k}^{s_k} e^{A(t_{k+1}-\Delta-\tau)}d\tau = \int_{t_k+\Delta}^{\hat{s}_k} e^{A(t_{k+1}-\tau)}d\tau.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\hat{s}_k}^{t_{k+1}} e^{A(t_{k+1}-\tau)}Bd\tau\cdot u_k + e^{A(t_{k+1}-\hat{s}_k)}\int_{t_k}^{s_k} e^{A(s_k-\tau)}Bd\tau\cdot u_k &= \int_{t_k+\Delta}^{t_{k+1}} e^{A(t_{k+1}-\tau)}Bd\tau\cdot u_k \\ &= e^{A(h-\Delta)}\int_0^{h-\Delta} e^{-A\tau}Bd\tau\cdot u_k.\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

From (46), (47), and (48), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{x}(t_{k+1}) &= \Lambda(I+\Theta)x(t_k) + \Lambda(I+\Theta)\int_0^{h-\Delta} e^{-A\tau}Bd\tau\cdot u_k \\ &= \Lambda(I+\Theta)(x(t_k)-\hat{x}(t_k)) + \Lambda(I+\Theta)\hat{x}(t_k) + \Lambda(I+\Theta)\int_0^{h-\Delta} e^{-A\tau}Bd\tau\cdot u_k,\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

where $\Lambda := e^{Ah}$ and $\Theta := e^{-A\Delta} - I$.

On the other hand, it follows from the state equation (1) that

$$\begin{aligned}x(t_{k+1}) &= e^{Ah}x(t_k) + \int_0^h e^{A(h-\tau)}Bd\tau\cdot u_k \\ &= \Lambda x(t_k) + \Lambda\int_0^{h-\Delta} e^{-A\tau}Bd\tau\cdot u_k.\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}&x(t_{k+1}) - \hat{x}(t_{k+1}) \\ &\quad= (\Lambda - \Lambda(I+\Theta))x(t_k) + \left(\Lambda\int_0^{h-\Delta} e^{-A\tau}Bd\tau - \Lambda(I+\Theta)\int_0^{h-\Delta} e^{-A\tau}Bd\tau\right)u_k \\ &\quad= -\Lambda\Theta(x(t_k)-\hat{x}(t_k)) - \Lambda\Theta\hat{x}(t_k) + \Lambda\left(\int_0^{h-\Delta} e^{-A\tau}Bd\tau - (I+\Theta)\int_0^{h-\Delta} e^{-A\tau}Bd\tau\right).\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

From (49) and (50), we obtain the $F_\Delta$ and $G_\Delta$ in (5). Moreover, we have $H_\Delta = [0 \;\; I]$ by the definition of the closed-loop state. ■

### *B. Intersample Bound of the Extended Discretized System*

Here we show that if the plant state $x$ and its estimate $\hat{x}$ converge to the origin at the ZOH-updating instants, then the intersample values of $x$ and $\hat{x}$ also converge to the origin. We assume the clock offset is constant, but this convergence would also hold for time-varying clock offsets.

**Proposition B.1:** Assume that the extended discretized system (4) is stabilized by an LTI controller with state $x_{c,k}$, that is, $\xi_k, x_{c,k} \to 0$ $(k \to \infty)$. Then we have $x(t), \hat{x}(t) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$.

**Proof:** Since $\xi_k \to 0$, it follows that $y_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. In conjunction with $x_{c,k} \to 0$, this gives $u_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Since for each $k$,

$$x(t_k + \tau) = e^{A\tau} x(t_k) + \int_0^\tau e^{A(\tau - t)} B dt \cdot u_k,$$

for all $\tau \in [0, h)$, we obtain

$$|x(t_k + \tau)| \le e^{\|A\|h} \|x(t_k)\| + \int_0^h e^{\|A\|h} \|B\| dt \cdot \|u_k\|.$$

Hence we derive $x(t) \to 0$ $(t \to \infty)$ from $x(t_k), u_k \to 0$. Similarly, if $0 \le \tau < \hat{s}_k$, then

$$|\hat{x}(t_k + \tau)| \le e^{\|A\|h} \|\hat{x}(t_k)\| + \int_0^h e^{\|A\|h} \|B\| dt \cdot \|u_k\|,$$

and if $\hat{s}_k \le \tau < h$, then

$$\|\hat{x}(t_k + \tau)\| \le e^{\|A\|h} \|x(s_k)\| + \int_0^h e^{\|A\|h} \|B\| dt \cdot \|u_k\|.$$

Since $x(s_k), \hat{x}(t_k), u_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, we have $\hat{x}(t) \to 0$ $(t \to \infty)$. ■

### *C. Proof of Lemmas 4.7 and 4.9*

Although the results of Lemmas 4.7 and 4.9 are known (see, e.g., [13]), we give new proofs based on Theorem 3.1.

**Proof of Lemma 4.7:** We obtain an $\mathcal{RH}^\infty$ coprime factorization $P_\theta = N_\theta / D_\theta$ with

$$N_\theta(z) := \frac{(\lambda - 1)z}{z - c} - \theta \frac{\lambda z(z - 1)}{z - c}, \quad D_\theta(z) := \frac{1 - \lambda z}{z - c}, \tag{51}$$

where $c$ is a fixed complex number with $|c| > 1$. If we define $X_0$ and $Y_0$ as in (24), then the Bezout identity $N_0 X_0 + D_0 Y_0 = 1$ holds. Hence defining $T_1$ and $T_2$ by (24), we see that $U_\theta + V_\theta Q$ in (9) satisfies

$$U_\theta + V_\theta Q = 1 - \theta (T_1 + T_2 Q) \quad (Q \in \mathcal{RH}^\infty). \tag{52}$$

Theorem 3.1 and (52) show that the plant $P_\theta$ is simultaneously stabilizable by a single LTI controller if and only if there exists $Q \in \mathcal{RH}^\infty$ such that

$$(1 - \theta(T_1 + T_2 Q))^{-1} \in \mathcal{RH}^\infty \qquad (\theta \in S). \tag{53}$$

We have (53) if and only if $1 - \theta(T_1 + T_2 Q)$ has no zero in $\bar{\mathbb{D}}$ for all $\theta \in S$, that is, $T_1(z) + T_2(z)Q(z) \in \mathbb{G}$ for all $z \in \bar{\mathbb{D}}$.

It is now enough to show that $G \in \mathcal{RH}^\infty$ if and only if $f := T_1 + T_2 Q$ satisfies $f \in \mathcal{RH}^\infty$ and the interpolation conditions in the lemma.

Suppose that $Q \in \mathcal{RH}^\infty$. Since $T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{RH}^\infty$, we have $f = T_1 + T_2 Q \in \mathcal{RH}^\infty$. Moreover, since the unstable zeros of $T_2$ are $0$, $1$, and $1/\lambda$ and since $Q$ has no unstable poles, it follows that $f(0) = T_1(0) = 0$, $f(1) = T_1(1) = 0$, and $f(1/\lambda) = T_1(1/\lambda) = -1$.

Conversely, let $f \in \mathcal{RH}^\infty$ satisfy $f(0) = 0$, $f(1) = 0$, and $f(1/\lambda) = -1$. If we define

$$Q := \frac{f - T_1}{T_2}, \tag{54}$$

then $Q$ belongs to $\mathcal{RH}^\infty$. Assume, to get a contradiction, that $Q \notin \mathcal{RH}^\infty$. Since

$$T_2 Q = f - T_1 \in \mathcal{RH}^\infty, \tag{55}$$

it follows that $Q$ has some unstable poles that are zeros of $T_2$ in $\bar{\mathbb{D}}$. Let $p_0$ be one of the poles. Since $T_2$ has only simple zeros in $\bar{\mathbb{D}}$, it follows that $(T_2 Q)(p_0) \neq 0$. The interpolation conditions of $f$ lead to $f(p_0) - T_1(p_0) = 0$, which contradicts the equality in (55). ■

**Proof of Lemma 4.9:** Let $f$ be a solution to Problem 4.8, and set $g = \phi \circ f$. Then we derive the equivalence between (27) and (28). Since $\phi$ is a conformal map, we see that $f$ is holomorphic in $\bar{\mathbb{D}}$ if and only if $g$ is so.

Regarding the rationality of solutions, since $\phi^{-1}$ is given by a rational function in (25) and since $f = \phi^{-1} \circ g$, it follows that $f$ is rational for every rational solution $g$.

Conversely, $\phi \circ f$ may not be rational for a rational function $f$. However, $\phi \circ f$ is holomorpic in $\bar{\mathbb{D}}$, and hence it is an irrational solution of the Nevanlinna-Pick interpolation problem. If the Nevanlinna-Pick interpolation problem is solvable, then there exists a rational solution, which can be obtained from the Schur-Nevanlinna algorithm, e.g., in [10], [20] and the explicit formula of the solutions in [3, Sec. 2.11]. We therefore have the desired rational function $g$. ■

*D. Proof of Proposition 5.2*

Without loss of generality, we assume that $b/a = 1$. With the 2-periodic controller (40), the extended system (17) can be written as

$$\xi_{k+2} = \left( F^2 - \begin{bmatrix} FG & G \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -K_2HG & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} K_1 & 0 \\ 0 & K_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} H \\ HF \end{bmatrix} \right) \xi_k, \tag{56}$$

where

$$F := \begin{bmatrix} -\lambda\theta & -\lambda\theta \\ \lambda(1+\theta) & \lambda(1+\theta) \end{bmatrix}, \quad G := \begin{bmatrix} -\lambda\theta \\ \lambda(1+\theta) - 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad H := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Denote the characteristic polynomial $\rho(\lambda)$ of the matrix in (56) by $\rho(\lambda) = \lambda^2 + \alpha_1\lambda + \alpha_0$. The coefficients $\alpha_0, \alpha_1$ are given as

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_0 &:= \zeta p^2\theta^2, \\ \alpha_1 &:= -\zeta\lambda^2\theta^2 + (2\zeta - \eta)(1-\lambda)\lambda\theta - (\zeta - \eta + 1)\lambda^2 + (2\zeta - \eta)\lambda - \zeta, \end{aligned}$$

where $\zeta := K_1K_2$ and $\eta := K_1 + K_2$. From the Jury stability test, we have that stability of (56) is equivalent to the following three inequalities i)–iii): i) The first condition is given by

$$1 - \alpha_0 = 1 - \zeta\lambda^2\theta^2 > 0. \tag{57}$$

ii) Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_0 &= (2\zeta - \eta)(1-\lambda)\lambda\theta - (\zeta - \eta - 1)\lambda^2 + (2\zeta - \eta)\lambda - \zeta + 1 \\ &= (1-\lambda)\left\{(2\zeta - \eta)\lambda\theta + (\zeta - \eta + 1)\lambda - \zeta + 1\right\} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

This inequality is equivalent to the following inequalities:

$$\begin{cases} \theta < -\frac{(\zeta-\eta+1)\lambda-\zeta+1}{(2\zeta-\eta)\lambda} & \text{if } 2\zeta - \eta > 0 \\ \zeta > 1 & \text{if } 2\zeta - \eta = 0 \\ \theta > -\frac{(\zeta-\eta+1)\lambda-\zeta+1}{(2\zeta-\eta)\lambda} & \text{if } 2\zeta - \eta < 0. \end{cases} \tag{58}$$

iii) Finally,

$$1 - \alpha_1 + \alpha_0 = 2\zeta\lambda^2\theta^2 + \lambda(\lambda-1)(2\zeta - \eta)\theta + (\zeta - \eta + 1)\lambda^2 - (2\zeta - \eta)\lambda + \zeta + 1 > 0. \tag{59}$$

In what follows, we fix a controller, or $(\zeta, \eta)$, and then evaluate the range of permissible $\theta$ with the controller. Suppose that $\zeta > 0$ and $2\zeta - \eta < 0$. For such parameters $(\zeta, \eta)$, (57) and (58) are reduced to

$$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{\zeta}\lambda} < \theta < \frac{1}{\sqrt{\zeta}\lambda} \tag{60}$$

and

$$\theta > -\frac{(\zeta - \eta + 1)\lambda - \zeta + 1}{(2\zeta - \eta)\lambda}, \tag{61}$$

respectively. Select the parameters $(\zeta, \eta)$ so that the lower bounds on $\theta$ in (60) and (61) coincide with each other. That is, $\zeta$ and $\eta$ are chosen to satisfy the following relation:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\zeta}} = \frac{(\zeta - \eta + 1)\lambda - \zeta + 1}{2\zeta - \eta}. \tag{62}$$

Moreover, we select $(\zeta, \eta)$ so that (59) holds for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. This implies that

$$(\lambda - 1)^2(2\zeta - \eta)^2 - 8\zeta\left\{(\zeta - \eta + 1)p^2 - (2\zeta - \eta)\lambda + \zeta + 1\right\} < 0. \tag{63}$$

With the above class of controllers, where $\zeta$ and $\eta$ satisfy $\zeta > 0$, $2\zeta - \eta < 0$, (62), and (63), the conditions (57)–(59) for stability hold if and only if (60) follows. We will show that $\zeta$ and $\eta$ satisfy $\zeta > 0$, $2\zeta - \eta < 0$, (62), and (63) if and only if

$$\zeta \in (\kappa^2, 1), \tag{64}$$

$$\eta = \frac{\sqrt{\zeta}\left\{(\lambda - 1)\zeta - 2\sqrt{\zeta} + \lambda + 1\right\}}{\sqrt{\zeta}\lambda - 1}, \tag{65}$$

where $\kappa$ is defined in (5.2). We then analyze the bounds on $\theta$ followed by (60) when the controller belongs the class characterized by (64) and (65).

The equation (65) is obtained from (62) with the fact that $\sqrt{\zeta}\lambda - 1 \neq 0$.

We now aim to show (64). Substituting (62) into (63) and using $2\zeta - \eta < 0$, we have that (63) is satisfied if and only if

$$\eta < 2\left(\zeta + 2\sqrt{\zeta}\frac{\sqrt{2} - 1}{\lambda - 1}\right). \tag{66}$$

From (65) and (66), $\zeta$ satisfies

$$\frac{(\sqrt{\zeta} - \kappa)(\sqrt{\zeta} - \kappa')}{\sqrt{\zeta}\lambda - 1} > 0, \tag{67}$$

where $\kappa'$ is given as

$$\kappa' := \frac{-\sqrt{\lambda^2+1}\sqrt{\lambda^2-4\sqrt{2}+5}-2(\sqrt{2}-1)\lambda}{\lambda^2-1}.$$

Note that $\sqrt{\zeta}-\kappa' > 0$ from $\lambda > 1$. Thus, from (67), $\zeta$ satisfies one of the following two cases: i) $\sqrt{\zeta} > 1/\lambda$ and $\sqrt{\zeta} > \kappa$, or ii) $\sqrt{\zeta} < 1/\lambda$ and $\sqrt{\zeta} < \kappa$. A routine calculation shows that $\kappa > 1/\lambda$. Thus, i) is reduced to $\sqrt{\zeta} > \kappa$ and ii) is to $\sqrt{\zeta} < 1/\lambda$. On the other hand, from $2\zeta - \eta < 0$ and (65), it follows that $\sqrt{\zeta} > 1/\lambda$ and $\zeta < 1$. Therefore, we arrive at (64).

Conversely, (64) implies that $\zeta > 0$. Moreover, from (65), we have (62) and

$$2\zeta - \eta = \frac{\sqrt{\zeta}(\zeta-1)(\lambda+1)}{\sqrt{\zeta}\lambda - 1}.$$

The right-hand side is negative by (64) and the fact $\kappa > 1/\lambda$. Note also that (63) holds if $\zeta$ and $\eta$ are taken as (64) and (65).

Finally, taking the supremum and the infimum of the upper bound and the lower bound on $\theta$ in (60) over (64), we conclude the proof. ■

## REFERENCES


[1] V. Blondel, G. Campion, and M. Gevers. A sufficient condition for simultaneous stabilization. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 38:1264–1266, 1993.

[2] M. C. de Oliveira, J. Bernussou, and J. C. Geromel. A new discrete-time robust stability condition. *Systems Control Lett.*, 37:261–265, 1999.

[3] C. Foiaş, H. Özbay, and A. Tannenbaum. *Robust Control of Infinite Dimensional Systems: Frequency Domain Methods*. London: Springer, 1996.

[4] B. A. Francis. *A Course in $H_\infty$ Control Theory*. New York: Springer, 1987.

[5] N. M. Freris, S. R. Graham, and P. R. Kumar. Fundamental limits on synchronizing clocks over network. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 56:1352–1364, 2011.

[6] B. K. Ghosh. An approach to simultaneous system design. Part II: Nonswitching gain and dynamic feedback compensation by algebraic geometric methods. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 26:919–963, 1988.

[7] S. Graham and P. R. Kumar. Time in general-purpose control systems: The Control Time Protocol and an experimental evaluation. In *Proc. 43rd IEEE CDC*, 2004.

[8] J. He, P. Cheng, L. Shi, C. Chen, and Y. Sun. Time synchronization in WSNs: A maximum-value-based consensus approach. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 59:660–675, 2014.

[9] X. Jiang, J. Zhang, J. J. Harding, B. J. Makela, and A. D. Domíngues-García. Spoofing GPS receiver clock offset of phasor measurement units. *IEEE Trans. Power Systems*, 28:3253–3262, 2013.

[10] L. A. Luxemburg and P. R. Brown. The scalar Nevanlinna-Pick interpolation problem with boundary conditions. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 235:2615–2625, 2011.

[11] H. Maeda and M. Vidyasagar. Some results on simultaneous stabilization. *Systems Control Lett.*, 5:205–208, 1984.

[12] K. Okano, M. Wakaiki, and J. P. Hespanha. Real-time control under clock offsets between sensors and controllers. In *Proc. HSCC'15*, 2015.

[13] A. W. Olbrot and M. Nikodem. Robust stabilization: Some extensions of the gain margin maximization problem. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 39:652–657, 1994.

[14] I.-K. Rhee, J. Lee, J. Kim, E. Serpedin, and Y.-C. Wu. Clock synchronization in wireless sensor networks: An overview. *Sensors*, 9:56–85, 2009.

[15] H.-B. Shi and L. Qi. Static output feedback simultaneous stabilisation via coordinates transformations with free variables. *IET Control Theory Appl.*, 3:1051–1058, 2009.

[16] M. Vidyasagar. *Control System Synthesis: A Factorization Approach*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1985, Republished in Morgan & Claypool, 2011.

[17] M. Vidyasagar and N. Viswanadham. Algebraic design techniques for reliable stabilization. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 27:1085–1095, 1982.

[18] M. Wakaiki, K. Okano, and J. P. Hespanha. Control under clock offsets and actuator saturation. In *Proc. 54th IEEE CDC*, 2015.

[19] M. Wakaiki, K. Okano, and J. P. Hespanha. Stabilization of networked control systems with clock offsets. In *Proc. ACC'15*, 2015.

[20] M. Wakaiki, Y. Yamamoto, and H. Özbay. Sensitivity reduction by strongly stabilizing controllers for MIMO distributed parameter systems. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 57:2089–2094, 2012.

[21] D. Youla, J. Bongiorno, and C. Lu. Single-loop feedback stabilization of linear multivariable dynamical plants. *Automatica*, 10:159–173, 1974.